

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments, and the discussion that follows. Claim 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-9 and 11-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fedorov (U.S. Pat. No. 6,047,060) in view of Shaffer (U.S. Pat. No. 6,363,145) and claim 10 further in view of Miloslavsky (U.S. Pat. No. 6,021,428). Claims 1, 11, 13, and 20 have been amended for clarification. After a careful review of the claims and references, it is believed that the claims are in allowable form and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 11-20 were rejected as being obvious over Fedorov in view of Shaffer. Fedorov concerns a system and method to allow a supervisor to manually connect into and monitor telephone calls to and from a call center. Fedorov does not describe automatic monitoring of a data session between agent and caller, nor does Fedorov describe automatically engaging the supervisor in response to the monitoring. Shaffer describes automatic monitoring but only of voice and does not automatically engage the supervisor in response to the monitoring but requires the supervisor to select the option to establish monitoring after notification. Miloslavsky describes a system for routing incoming e-mails to the most appropriate agent.

Independent Claims 1, 11, and 20 claim automatic monitoring of a data session between a first and second party and conferencing, joining, or engaging a third party into the transaction as an additional participant automatically in response to the automatic monitoring. These claims have been amended to clarify that established, on-going transactions are monitored (e.g., see paragraphs 30-32). Claim 13 has been amended to clarify that keywords indicate desire to deal with a supervisor. The call monitoring described in Col. 5, lines 26-29 of Fedorov cited in the Office Action is manual monitoring of telephone conversations (i.e., "a supervisor at one station may monitor telephone conversations at another station"; Abstract, lines 7-8) but is not the claimed automatic monitoring of data sessions (e.g. made up of text messages, data messages, e-mail, etc.). Fedorov also does not teach automatically engaging the supervisor into the data session in response to the monitoring. The claimed monitoring automatically engages, conferences, or joins the supervisor to view an ongoing data session (see page 13, lines 1-3) after the automatic monitoring has detected a need to engage the supervisor. Fedorov does not teach automatic monitoring, does not concern data sessions and does not teach automatically conferencing or engaging the third parties (e.g. supervisor) in response to the automatic

monitoring. In Fedorov, the supervisor must decide to listen in and must spend time manually “monitoring” a conversation himself without being automatically engaged in response to automatic detection of a problem by automatic monitoring. The Office Action concedes that Fedorov does not teach data sessions, automatic monitoring and automatic engaging.

The claims call for the third party (e.g. supervisor) to be automatically engaged, joined or conferenced in response to the automatic monitoring. The Office Action concedes that Fedorov and Miloslavsky do not teach automatic monitoring and engaging but that Shaffer does disclose automation. However, Shaffer monitors only voice not data message sessions (Col. 2, lines 25-35) and further merely notifies the supervisor but does not automatically engage the supervisor into the transaction. Instead, a notification is sent to the supervisor who then must manually select from a number of options (see Col. 6, lines 33-52).

Shaffer does not teach or suggest automatically engaging the supervisor into the transaction as a participant but instead teaches merely notifying the supervisor and presenting options that the supervisor can subsequently select. The Office Action cites Col. 4, lines 17-27 as teaching automatically engaging the supervisor. However, this passage describes automatically monitoring but says nothing about automatically engaging or conferencing the supervision into the transaction. Rather, during automatic monitoring, if a voice pattern is detected, the supervisor is notified (e.g., by a message displayed on supervisor terminal with various options to manually select, including manually choosing to monitor the call. Col. 6, lines 37-43; also see Col. 5, lines 33-35 and Col. 7, lines 48-57). The Office Action also cites Shaffer at Col. 5, lines 36-65 as disclosing automatically engaging the supervisor within the monitoring session. However, the claim calls for automatically conferencing, joining or engaging the third party into the transaction as a participant. The cited passage of Shaffer discloses automatic monitoring and the performance of some or all of that monitoring processing by the supervisor terminal (“If demand on the first agent’s terminal’s processor resources increase...the monitoring session data can be transmitted to the supervisor terminal 14 or the gateway 16 where the monitoring session can be continued.” lines 58-65). This merely describes the automatic monitoring and using the supervisor terminal computer or the gateway computer to do some or all of the processing to automatically monitor the voice session, but does not describe automatically engaging the supervisor into the transaction as a participant in the transaction. The supervisor himself is not engaged in the transaction as a participant, only the processing power of the supervisor terminal is being used, not to engage the supervisor, but to perform the preceding

step of automated silent monitoring. Thus, a transfer of the automatic monitoring function from one terminal to another is described, not the joining or engagement of an additional participant into the transaction. Therefore, Shaffer does not disclose automatically engaging or conferencing, nor does it disclose automatic data session monitoring.


Claim 10 has been rejected on being obvious over Fedorov and Shaffer, and further in view of Miloslavsky. Miloslavsky merely discloses routing of e-mails to agents. Thus Miloslavsky concerns the act of routing which occurs prior to the data session between the two parties. Miloslavsky thus merely establishes that incoming e-mails and routing of these to an agent in a call center was disclosed but does not teach or suggest that e-mails can be substituted for voice communications in an audio listening system such as Fedorov. The Office Action cited Col. 36, lines 9-36 as disclosing automatic inspection of content of data messages. However, this passage merely describes that e-mails may be diverse and describes routing the e-mails (again, this is prior to the session or transaction between the two parties becoming established), but there is no disclosure of monitoring established or on-going e-mail or data sessions between two parties (i.e., a session established between agent and customer can only occur after the agent has been selected by the router). Further, the combination of Fedorov and Shaffer with Miloslavsky would simply provide a call center which can receive both voice and e-mail wherein the supervisor could decide to manually barge in to listen to the voice. Listening to the data messages such as e-mails would merely result in noise with no meaning to the supervisor. Thus, the combination of Fedorov with Miloslavsky is improper, and even if combined does not teach or suggest automatic monitoring of e-mails during established transactions, or automatic engaging of supervisor into the transaction based upon the monitoring.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 11, and 20 are believed to be distinguishable over the combination of Fedorov, Miloslavsky, and Shaffer because none of these references discloses monitoring data sessions established between two parties and none discloses automatically engaging the supervisor into the transaction in response to the automatic monitoring. Therefore, independent Claims 1, 11, and 20 are believed to be neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by any combination of the cited references. In addition claims 2-10, and 12-19 are dependent upon now allowable Claims 1, 11, and 20, and therefore are also believed to be in allowable form.

As discussed above, claims 1-20 are now in allowable form and are not anticipated or rendered obvious by any combination of the cited references. Therefore, allowance of claims 1-20 is believed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of

the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
James A. Scheer, Esq.
Registration No. 29, 434

Dated: April 30, 2008

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
Customer No. 24628